From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV] **Sent**: 8/15/2018 5:19:18 AM

To: Fairbanks, Brianna [Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov]; Huitric, Michele [Huitric.Michele@epa.gov]; Calvino, Maria

Soledad [Calvino.Maria@epa.gov]; Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]

Subject: Request legal review - SF Examiner responses

Attachments: 2001-4-27 Bldg 364 Peanut Spill Sandblast Grit.pdf

Below is a draft revised version of press response for your legal review. I left out the rad scanner van survey, since it has received so much skepticism, but it is true that we did the work, so we could keep it in also.

SF Examiner Responses

Q1: Has the US EPA fully reviewed the Parcel G work plan and if so, what improvements are needed, if any?

Ex. 5 AC/DP

Q2: Is it standard for the EPA comment period on plans like these to occur at the same time as the public's?

Ex. 5 AC/DP

Q3: What led to the EPA's independent review of Parcels G and D that found data inaccuracies of up to 97 percent in Tetra Tech's work last last year? What flaws were discovered?

Ex. 5 AC/DP

Q4: What previous assessment/testing has the U.S. EPA conducted at Parcel G?

Ex. 5 AC/DP

Q5: What authority does the EPA have over the Navy to assure that the procedures are followed in a way that doesn't lead to more retesting? Does the EPA feel that public trust in that process needs to be restored and, if so, how?

Ex. 5 AC/DP

Q6: Community members have expressed that they want different people to oversee Hunters Point from now on. Has anyone been reassigned in the EPA, and does the EPA have any authority to see that regulators at other involved agencies step aside?

Ex. 5 AC/DP

Lily Lee Cleanup Project Manager, Superfund Division US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3) San Francisco, CA 94105 415-947-4187